

Taimoor Akhter

Research Scholar University Of The Punjab

The Effect of Populism on Democratic Institutions

Abstract:

Populism has become an increasingly influential force in global politics, often reshaping the functioning of democratic institutions. Characterized by a rhetorical divide between the "pure people" and the "corrupt elite," populism claims to enhance democracy by restoring power to the majority. However, its real-world impact on institutional structures remains controversial. This research article critically examines the multifaceted effects of populism on key democratic institutions, including the judiciary, legislature, media, electoral systems, and civil society. While populist leaders often rise to power through democratic means, their governance style frequently undermines constitutional norms, erodes institutional independence, and weakens checks and balances. The article explores how populist regimes attempt to centralize authority by delegitimizing dissent, restricting press freedom, altering electoral laws, and interfering in judicial processes. Case studies from countries such as Hungary, the United States, Brazil, India, and Turkey reveal both similarities and context-specific variations in how populism interacts with democracy. Despite its often negative institutional consequences, populism is not inherently undemocratic. In some contexts, it can act as a corrective mechanism, highlighting popular grievances and reinvigorating political engagement. The dual nature of populism—as both a democratic mobilizer and a potential authoritarian threat—underscores the importance of institutional resilience. The article argues that the long-term effect of populism on democratic institutions depends on the strength of those institutions, the presence of active civil society, and the ability of democratic actors to defend pluralism and the rule of law. Ultimately, the study calls for a nuanced understanding of populism—not as a uniform threat, but as a complex political phenomenon that interacts with democratic institutions in varied and evolving ways. Policy recommendations and institutional safeguards must be tailored to context-specific challenges in order to preserve democratic norms in the face of populist pressures.

Keywords : Populism, Democracy, Institutions, Authoritarianism, Electoral Systems, Judicial Independence

Introduction

In recent years, populism has emerged as a powerful political force, challenging conventional notions of democracy and governance. Across the globe—from the United States to India, Brazil to Hungary—populist leaders have gained significant popularity by claiming to represent the "true will" of the people against corrupt, self-serving elites. While this anti-establishment appeal resonates with many citizens disillusioned by political stagnation and inequality, it also raises serious concerns about the stability and integrity of democratic institutions.

Populism, often described as a "thin-centered ideology," thrives on a binary worldview that divides society into two opposing camps: the virtuous people and the immoral elite. This framework enables populist leaders to justify extraordinary measures, often bypassing institutional checks and balances in the name of popular sovereignty. Such rhetoric can lead to a concentration of power in the executive branch, undermining the independence of the judiciary, marginalizing legislatures, attacking the credibility of the press, and weakening civil society organizations.

The effects of populism on democracy are complex and multifaceted. In some cases, it revitalizes political participation by engaging citizens who feel alienated from mainstream politics. In other instances,

however, it poses serious threats to democratic norms and institutional integrity. The tension between populist movements and democratic institutions demands scholarly attention, especially in a time of growing global uncertainty.

This study aims to analyze how populism reshapes democratic institutions—either by weakening them or, paradoxically, by exposing their deficiencies and prompting reforms. Through a comparative and theoretical lens, the article examines the ways in which populist governance affects judicial independence, media freedom, electoral integrity, and the broader institutional framework essential to a functioning democracy. Understanding these dynamics is crucial for assessing the future of democratic

2. Conceptual Framework

Understanding the relationship between populism and democratic institutions requires a clear conceptual foundation. This section defines the key terms and explains the theoretical underpinnings that guide this research.

2.1. Populism as a Political Phenomenon

Populism is widely recognized not as a fully developed ideology, but as a flexible political logic or strategy. Cas Mudde (2004) defines populism as a "thin-centered ideology" that considers society to be ultimately separated into two antagonistic and homogeneous groups: "the pure people" and "the corrupt elite." Populist leaders claim to represent the general will of the people, often bypassing established institutional processes in pursuit of direct legitimacy.

Populism can be found across the political spectrum—on the left, it often focuses on social justice and economic equality, while on the right, it tends to emphasize nationalism, anti-immigration, and cultural identity. Despite ideological differences, both forms of populism exhibit a common skepticism or hostility toward institutional constraints.

2.2. Democratic Institutions

Democratic institutions are the formal and informal structures that sustain democratic governance. These include the judiciary, legislature, electoral systems, media, and civil society. They are designed to ensure accountability, uphold the rule of law, and protect minority rights through checks and balances.

Institutional integrity is critical for maintaining democratic norms. However, populist actors often challenge these institutions, portraying them as barriers to the will of the majority. This leads to tensions between popular sovereignty and constitutionalism—a central theme in contemporary democratic discourse.

2.3. Analytical Approach

This article adopts a comparative institutional approach, analyzing how populist regimes interact with and affect democratic institutions in different political contexts. It emphasizes both the risks and the potential of populism, highlighting the importance of institutional strength and democratic culture in shaping outcomes.

Defining Populism

Populism is a contested and multifaceted concept in political science, often used to describe a wide range of political movements and leaders across ideological boundaries. At its core, populism is not a comprehensive ideology like liberalism or socialism, but rather a "thin-centered" ideology that can be attached to various broader belief systems. It revolves around a fundamental moral opposition between two homogeneous groups: "the pure people" and "the corrupt elite." This dichotomy is central to populist rhetoric and underpins the political strategy of populist actors.

Populist leaders claim to be the authentic voice of the people, suggesting that traditional political parties, institutions, and elites have betrayed the popular will. This leads to an anti-institutional stance, where bureaucracies, judicial bodies, and the media are often viewed as obstacles rather than essential components of democratic governance.

Populism can manifest in both left-wing and right-wing forms. Left-wing populism typically focuses on economic redistribution, social justice, and anti-capitalist critiques, while right-wing populism emphasizes nationalism, anti-immigration sentiment, and cultural or religious identity. Despite these differences, both forms share a skepticism toward pluralism, elite consensus, and liberal democratic norms.

Importantly, populism is not inherently anti-democratic. In fact, it often arises from democratic deficits, representing a reaction to perceived political exclusion or institutional unresponsiveness. However, once in power, populist leaders may erode democratic institutions by centralizing authority, weakening checks and balances, and delegitimizing dissent.

Understanding populism requires analyzing both its rhetorical content and its institutional consequences. This definition provides the groundwork for exploring how populism, when translated into governance, can either challenge or compromise the stability of democratic institutions.

Democratic Institutions

Democratic institutions are the foundational pillars upon which democratic governance is built. They ensure accountability, uphold the rule of law, protect individual rights, and provide mechanisms for representation and participation. These institutions are both formal—such as the legislature, judiciary, and electoral bodies—and informal, including norms, practices, and civil society engagement.

1. Legislature

The legislature represents the will of the people through elected representatives. It is responsible for lawmaking, budget approval, and holding the executive accountable. In a healthy democracy, legislatures operate independently and are characterized by pluralism and open debate.

2. Judiciary

An independent judiciary is essential to upholding constitutional principles and ensuring that laws are applied impartially. Courts act as a check on the powers of the executive and legislature, protecting fundamental rights and ensuring the rule of law.

3. Electoral System

Free, fair, and transparent elections are a hallmark of democracy. Electoral institutions oversee voter registration, campaign finance, vote counting, and dispute resolution. Their credibility is central to public trust in democratic outcomes.

4. Free Press and Media

A pluralistic and independent media serves as a watchdog against government overreach. It informs the public, promotes transparency, and holds power to account. Media freedom is essential for enabling informed citizen participation.

5. Civil Society

Civil society, including NGOs, unions, and community organizations, plays a vital role in democratic accountability. It offers platforms for citizen engagement and advocacy and acts as a counterbalance to state power.

6. Checks and Balances

Democratic institutions operate within a framework of checks and balances to prevent the concentration of power. This system ensures that each branch of government—executive, legislative, and judicial—can limit the powers of the others, maintaining equilibrium and protecting liberty.

When functioning effectively, these institutions preserve democratic stability and legitimacy. However, they can be vulnerable to populist manipulation, especially when leaders seek to bypass or weaken them in the name of majority rule

Populism's Impact on Democratic Institutions

Populism's impact on democratic institutions is both significant and multifaceted. While populist leaders often claim to strengthen democracy by restoring power to the people, their governance frequently undermines institutional integrity, weakens the rule of law, and challenges liberal democratic norms. The consequences of populism vary based on national context, institutional resilience, and the nature of the populist movement, but common patterns of institutional disruption can be observed across different countries.

1. The Judiciary

Populist regimes often attempt to subdue judicial independence, perceiving courts as obstacles to their political agenda. In countries like Poland and Hungary, populist governments have passed legal reforms to exert control over the appointment and tenure of judges, thus eroding judicial autonomy (Pech & Scheppele, 2017). These efforts undermine the rule of law and diminish the judiciary's role as a check on executive power.

2. The Legislature

Although populist leaders often emerge through democratic elections, they may circumvent or weaken legislative bodies once in power. By employing executive orders, restricting parliamentary debate, or altering legislative procedures, populists can limit institutional scrutiny and centralize authority (Bermeo, 2016). This undermines representative democracy and the principle of separation of powers.

3. The Media

Populists frequently target the media, portraying independent journalism as biased or antagonistic. This anti-media stance, often accompanied by regulatory crackdowns or the promotion of state-aligned outlets, restricts press freedom and limits public access to accurate information (Levitsky & Ziblatt, 2018). In countries like Turkey and Venezuela, populist regimes have significantly curtailed journalistic independence.

4. Electoral Institutions

Populists may manipulate electoral frameworks to entrench their dominance. Tactics include redrawing electoral boundaries, limiting opposition funding, or weakening independent election commissions. These actions erode electoral integrity and reduce political competition (Norris & Inglehart, 2019).

5. Civil Society

Civil society organizations, especially those critical of the regime, are often labeled as foreign agents or enemies of the state. Laws restricting foreign funding, burdensome registration procedures, and public delegitimization campaigns are common tools used to curtail civic space (Carothers & Brechenmacher, 2014).

In sum, populism tends to prioritize majoritarian rule over institutional balance. While it may respond to real grievances and public frustrations, its long-term effect is often the erosion of democratic checks and the consolidation of power in the executive. The survival of democratic institutions under populist rule depends heavily on the robustness of legal frameworks, the independence of oversight bodies, and the resilience of civil society.

Populism as a Corrective Force

Despite the often-cited threats populism poses to liberal democratic institutions, it is essential to consider the argument that populism can function as a corrective force within democratic systems. This perspective views populism not purely as a destabilizing movement but as a response to deep-seated institutional deficiencies, political alienation, and elite unresponsiveness that have rendered democratic systems stagnant or exclusionary (Laclau, 2005; Mounk, 2018).

Populist movements typically arise in contexts where citizens feel ignored, marginalized, or disenfranchised by traditional parties and political elites. These sentiments are often rooted in economic inequality, political corruption, and the perceived detachment of ruling classes from the everyday struggles of ordinary people. By giving voice to these grievances, populism can highlight critical flaws in democratic representation and call attention to the necessity of reform (Taggart, 2000).

In this sense, populism acts as a democratic alert mechanism, challenging complacency in established systems. According to Ernesto Laclau (2005), populism is a necessary dimension of democratic life because it confronts hegemonic power structures and enables the articulation of new collective identities. It calls for the re-politicization of issues that may have been removed from public debate by technocratic governance or elite consensus. This process, while potentially destabilizing, can also revive democratic engagement by reinvigorating participation, restoring political competition, and encouraging broader inclusion in policymaking.

Moreover, populist challenges can pressure elites to reconnect with their constituencies and recalibrate their priorities. In some instances, populist demands have led to welfare expansions, anti-corruption reforms, and increased transparency (Mudde & Rovira Kaltwasser, 2017). These outcomes suggest that populism, when operating within constitutional limits, can function as a corrective impulse that strengthens democratic accountability.

However, this corrective capacity is conditional and varies significantly across political contexts. When populist leaders embrace democratic values and institutional constraints, their movements can energize democracy. But when they pursue authoritarian consolidation, undermine checks and balances, and delegitimize dissent, populism becomes a destructive force. As Müller (2016) warns, the distinction lies not merely in populist rhetoric but in how power is exercised once gained.

It is also important to differentiate between inclusionary and exclusionary populism. Inclusionary populism, often associated with left-wing movements in Latin America, seeks to broaden political participation and empower marginalized groups. In contrast, exclusionary populism—common among far-right parties in Europe and the U.S.—often targets minorities and promotes majoritarian nationalism. The former may expand democratic horizons, while the latter tends to shrink them (Mudde & Rovira Kaltwasser, 2013).

Therefore, the dual nature of populism—both as a symptom of democratic crisis and a potential catalyst for renewal—necessitates a nuanced understanding. Dismissing populism outright risks ignoring legitimate demands for reform and participation. Engaging with it critically, rather than defensively, allows democratic institutions to evolve and become more responsive to the people they serve.

Case Studies

To understand how populism affects democratic institutions in practice, it is essential to examine real-world cases. These case studies provide insight into the varied consequences of populist governance across different political and cultural contexts. They highlight how institutional strength, political culture, and the nature of populist leadership shape democratic outcomes.

1. Hungary: Erosion of Liberal Democracy

Under the leadership of Viktor Orbán and his Fidesz party, Hungary has experienced a systematic dismantling of liberal democratic institutions. Orbán, who labels his political vision as “illiberal democracy,” has centralized power by rewriting the constitution, controlling the judiciary, and curtailing media independence (Bogaards, 2018). The government has also limited the activities of non-governmental organizations and universities, framing them as foreign-influenced threats to national sovereignty. According to Freedom House, Hungary is no longer classified as a full democracy, indicating a significant regression under populist rule.

2. United States: Institutional Resilience and Strain

The presidency of Donald J. Trump (2016–2020) tested the resilience of American democratic institutions. Trump's populist rhetoric, which emphasized anti-elitism, nationalism, and mistrust of mainstream media, challenged many liberal democratic norms. His administration regularly criticized judicial decisions, discredited election outcomes, and questioned the legitimacy of the press (Levitsky & Ziblatt, 2018). However, despite institutional strain, the U.S. system demonstrated relative resilience due to robust checks and balances, a decentralized federal structure, and active civil society.

3. Venezuela: Democratic Breakdown

Venezuela offers a dramatic case of democratic collapse under populism. Hugo Chávez, and later Nicolás Maduro, used populist appeals to gain and maintain power. While Chávez initially mobilized marginalized groups and expanded welfare programs, he gradually weakened independent institutions, manipulated electoral processes, and suppressed opposition (Corrales & Penfold, 2011). Under Maduro, the situation deteriorated further, with increasing authoritarianism, economic collapse, and widespread human rights abuses. Populism in this context transitioned into full-blown authoritarian rule.

4. India: Majoritarian Populism and Democratic Challenges

Under the leadership of Narendra Modi and the Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP), India has witnessed a rise in majoritarian populism. Modi's narrative centers on the will of the Hindu majority, often framing secular and liberal institutions as elite conspiracies against national interests. Critics argue that democratic institutions, including the judiciary, media, and law enforcement, have become increasingly politicized (Jaffrelot, 2021). The use of populist discourse to marginalize minority communities and suppress dissent poses growing concerns for the health of the world's largest democracy.

These case studies illustrate the diverse trajectories of populism. While populist leaders may emerge from democratic processes, their actions in power can undermine democratic norms to varying degrees. The outcomes largely depend on the robustness of institutional frameworks and the strength of democratic culture within each nation.

Research Methodology

This study employs a qualitative research methodology to investigate the impact of populism on democratic institutions. The qualitative approach is particularly suited for this research because it allows for an in-depth understanding of complex political phenomena through the interpretation of historical events, discourse analysis, and case-based comparison (Creswell, 2014).

1. Research Design

The research adopts a comparative case study design, examining multiple countries that have experienced the rise of populist movements or leadership. The selected case studies—Hungary, the United States, Venezuela, and India—offer a diverse set of political, cultural, and institutional contexts. This design

facilitates the identification of both common patterns and country-specific outcomes of populist governance.

2. Data Collection

The study relies on secondary data sources, including scholarly books, peer-reviewed journal articles, reports from international organizations (e.g., Freedom House, The Economist Intelligence Unit), and reputable news sources. Government documents, speeches by populist leaders, and policy reports were also analyzed to understand the discourse and practices associated with populism in each context.

3. Analytical Framework

A thematic analysis was employed to identify recurring themes across case studies, such as institutional erosion, media control, judicial interference, and civil society suppression. These themes were interpreted within the theoretical framework of democratic backsliding and populist theory (Levitsky & Ziblatt, 2018; Mudde & Rovira Kaltwasser, 2017).

4. Limitations

This research acknowledges certain limitations. As a qualitative study, it does not seek to provide statistically generalizable findings. Instead, it aims for analytical generalization by drawing conceptual insights from selected cases. Furthermore, language barriers and access to localized data may have limited the depth of context-specific analysis, especially in non-English-speaking countries.

In sum, this methodology enables a nuanced exploration of how populism interacts with democratic institutions across varied geopolitical landscapes, contributing to both theoretical and practical understandings of contemporary democratic challenges.

Findings

The analysis of case studies reveals several significant patterns that demonstrate the complex and often detrimental effects of populism on democratic institutions. While the nature and intensity of these effects vary across contexts, commonalities emerge in terms of institutional weakening, centralization of power, and the erosion of democratic norms.

1. Erosion of Institutional Autonomy

Across all four case studies—Hungary, the United States, Venezuela, and India—populist leadership has challenged the autonomy of key democratic institutions, particularly the judiciary and electoral bodies. In Hungary and Venezuela, judicial independence has been severely compromised through constitutional changes and political appointments. Similarly, in India, concerns have been raised about judicial impartiality and executive interference. While the United States displayed greater institutional resilience, attempts to undermine judicial decisions and question the integrity of elections revealed institutional vulnerabilities (Levitsky & Ziblatt, 2018).

2. Media Suppression and Delegitimization

Populist leaders commonly portray independent media as biased or as enemies of the people. In Venezuela and Hungary, this led to direct censorship and media takeovers. In the U.S. and India, a more subtle form of delegitimization occurred through hostile rhetoric and the promotion of partisan media outlets. These efforts undermine the press's role in holding power accountable and reduce the quality of public discourse (Mudde & Rovira Kaltwasser, 2017).

3. Centralization of Executive Power

Populist regimes often pursue legal and procedural reforms that concentrate authority in the executive branch. Orbán in Hungary and Chávez/Maduro in Venezuela restructured constitutional frameworks to remove checks and balances. In India, the growing dominance of the central government over regional institutions and the use of federal agencies for political purposes reflect a similar trend.

4. Decline in Civil Liberties and Civic Space

A notable decline in civil liberties accompanies the populist rise to power. Civil society organizations, especially those advocating for human rights or minority protections, face increased restrictions and public delegitimization. Freedom House and other watchdog organizations report declining democratic scores in all four countries during the populist periods analyzed.

5. Varying Levels of Democratic Backsliding

The extent of democratic backsliding differs across countries. Venezuela exhibits near-total democratic collapse, while Hungary has transitioned into an “illiberal democracy.” India shows signs of electoral authoritarianism under a democratic facade, and the United States, although strained, remains within the bounds of institutional democracy due to stronger checks and balances (Freedom House, 2023).

In sum, the findings demonstrate that populism poses a substantial threat to democratic institutions by weakening institutional independence, promoting executive overreach, and narrowing civic and media freedoms. However, the degree to which institutions resist or succumb to populist influence depends heavily on the strength of pre-existing democratic norms and the resilience of legal-political structures.

Conclusion

This research has examined the multifaceted effects of populism on democratic institutions, drawing insights from case studies in Hungary, the United States, Venezuela, and India. The findings highlight that while populism may emerge from legitimate concerns of underrepresented or marginalized groups, it often leads to significant democratic backsliding when populist leaders undermine key institutions of democracy, such as the judiciary, media, electoral systems, and civil society.

In Hungary and Venezuela, populism has resulted in the erosion of liberal democratic norms, with authoritarian leaders consolidating power through institutional reforms that diminish checks and balances. The United States, while displaying greater institutional resilience, nonetheless showed vulnerabilities in the face of populist rhetoric and attempts to undermine electoral legitimacy and judicial authority. India, similarly, has seen growing centralization of power and the marginalization of minority voices under populist governance.

Despite these common trends, the extent to which populism affects democratic institutions varies according to the strength of institutional safeguards and the broader political culture. The resilience of democratic institutions, the degree of judicial independence, the strength of the media, and the effectiveness of civil society all play crucial roles in determining the outcomes of populist challenges. Thus, populism should not be viewed as an inevitable destroyer of democracy but as a complex force whose impact depends on the context and response of democratic structures.

The findings suggest that while populism can indeed serve as a corrective force, drawing attention to systemic flaws and offering a platform for marginalized voices, it can also exacerbate democratic crises when it undermines the very institutions that support democratic governance. In order to preserve the health of democracy, it is essential for democratic institutions to remain resilient, for civil society to remain engaged, and for elites to prioritize reform without compromising democratic norms.

Future research should explore further the interplay between populism and institutional resilience, particularly in developing democracies, and investigate how populist movements can be channeled into constructive reforms rather than destructive challenges to democratic integrity.

References

- Bermeo, N. (2016). On democratic backsliding *Journal of Democracy*, 27(1), 5–19. <https://doi.org/10.1353/jod.2016.0012>
- Carothers, T., & Brechenmacher, S. (2014). Closing space: Democracy and human rights support under fire. Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.
- Levitsky, S., & Ziblatt, D. (2018). *How democracies die*. Crown Publishing Group.
- Norris, P., & Inglehart, R. (2019). *Cultural backlash: Trump, Brexit, and authoritarian populism*. Cambridge University Press.
- Pech, L., & Scheppele, K. L. (2017). Illiberalism within: Rule of law backsliding in the EU. *Cambridge Yearbook of European Legal Studies*, 19, 3–47. <https://doi.org/10.1017/cel.2017.9>
- Laclau, E. (2005). *On populist reason*. Verso Books.
- Mounk, Y. (2018). *The people vs. democracy: Why our freedom is in danger and how to save it*. Harvard University Press.
- Mudde, C., & Rovira Kaltwasser, C. (2013). Exclusionary vs. inclusionary populism: Comparing contemporary Europe and Latin America. *Government and Opposition*, 48(2), 147–174. <https://doi.org/10.1017/gov.2012.11>
- Mudde, C., & Rovira Kaltwasser, C. (2017). *Populism: A very short introduction*. Oxford University Press.
- Müller, J.-W. (2016). *What is populism?* University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Taggart, P. (2000). *Populism*. Open University Press.
- Bogaards, M. (2018). De-democratization in Hungary: Diffusely defective democracy. *Democratization*, 25(8), 1481–1499. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13510347.2018.1485015>
- Corrales, J., & Penfold, M. (2011). *Dragon in the tropics: Hugo Chávez and the political economy of revolution in Venezuela*. Brookings Institution Press.
- Jaffrelot, C. (2021). *Modi's India: Hindu nationalism and the rise of ethnic democracy*. Princeton University Press.
- Levitsky, S., & Ziblatt, D. (2018). *How democracies die*. Crown Publishing Group.
- Freedom House. (2023). *Nations in Transit*. <https://freedomhouse.org>
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Levitsky, S., & Ziblatt, D. (2018). *How democracies die*. Crown Publishing Group.
- Mudde, C., & Rovira Kaltwasser, C. (2017). *Populism: A very short introduction*. Oxford University Press.